

VZCZCXYZ0021  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHPE #1661/01 3241658  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O R 201658Z NOV 09  
FM AMEMBASSY LIMA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0126  
INFO RHMFISS/CDR USSOUTHCOM MIAMI FL  
RUEHBO/AMEMBASSY BOGOTA  
RUEHBR/AMEMBASSY BRASILIA 0055  
RUEHBU/AMEMBASSY BUENOS AIRES  
RUEHCV/AMEMBASSY CARACAS  
RUEHMN/AMEMBASSY MONTEVIDEO  
RUEHPE/AMEMBASSY LIMA  
RUEHQT/AMEMBASSY QUITO  
RUEHSG/AMEMBASSY SANTIAGO

C O N F I D E N T I A L LIMA 001661

SIPDIS  
DEPT ALSO FOR PM/RSAT (CPETRONE)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2019/11/20  
TAGS: [PREL](#) [PGOV](#) [MARR](#) [PE](#) [MOPS](#)  
SUBJECT: PERU: INFORMATION ON SECURITY DIALOGUE

REF: 09 STATE 112900

CLASSIFIED BY: McKinley P. Michael, Ambassador, State, Ambassador  
Peru; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

11. (U) Please find below Embassy Lima's responses to questions posed in reftel.

12. (SBU) Q: Does the United States currently have an established security dialogue with your country? Please report on all established or ad hoc dialogues of a pol-mil nature, regardless of the terminology by which they are described including: strategic dialogues, security dialogues, pol-mil working groups, security consultative mechanisms, or any variation or combination of these terms. Furthermore, for the sake of completeness, please detail any mechanisms or dialogues that are purely military-to-military in nature, to include military consultative discussions, scheduled high-level defense engagements, and so forth.

A: The U.S. and Peru have a formal dialogue mechanism referred to as the Bilateral Working Group (BWG) whose purpose is to discuss a wide range of security cooperation issues of bilateral and regional interest, including Shared Threats (mainly counter-terrorism and counter-narcotics), Technical Assistance, Information Sharing, Disaster Relief and Maritime Issues. A purely mil-to-mil (navy to navy) working group meets once a year in Mayport, FL. In addition, there is a continuous stream of ad hoc interchanges on pol-mil and mil-to-mil subjects that the Ambassador, DAO, MAAG and Political Section maintains with their host nation counterparts. In addition, there have been numerous ad hoc visits by senior military officers, civilian officials and subject material exchange experts.

13. (SBU) Q: When was the dialogue or mechanism first established? By what means was it established? Is the frequency of such meetings controlled through a binding agreement, or is this dialogue regulated by an informal understanding?

A: The USG and the GOP held their first BWG of a pol/mil to pol/mil nature in May of 2007 Washington DC with a follow-on meeting of a more Military to Military nature six months later. The BWG dialogue mechanism was established and is regulated through an informal understanding.

14. (SBU) Q: When did the group last meet? Does the USG or host government have a set schedule or any general expectations regarding the frequency of this exchange? When is the next scheduled meeting?

A: The second (last) BWG met 17-20 June 2009 in Lima. The next

BWG is expected to take place in Washington DC around the same month in 2010. We have not seen a set schedule.

15. (SBU) Q: Does the USG or host government hold any expectations as to the level of leadership hosting the exchange?

A: Both sides probably expect the BWG meetings to be led by senior civilian officials. The last BWG was chaired by a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for the USG and a Minister of Defense (MOD) representing the GOP.

16. (C) Q: PM would also be interested in Post's brief, honest assessment regarding the overall utility of the dialogue. Are new issues frequently broached, or has the dialogue devolved into a stagnant exchange of power point slides? If necessary, please use

classified communication to convey this honest assessment.

A: The BWG is a relatively new mechanism, and as such reflects several immature processes. Nonetheless, it has proven useful for making new contacts and has also allowed the formal and public identification of some contentious issues (SOFA, among others). Perhaps the most significant use to date was the setting of conditions that allowed receptivity to the concept of a force level assessment by the US DoD of the Peruvian Armed Forces. This was not a direct result of the BWG, but the theme presented by the US delegation was the need for a strategic overview and a strategic plan for Peruvian Armed Forces. By early August and with some additional engagement by DoD embassy staff, the Peruvian armed forces presented a request to the DoD for exactly such an assessment. The initiative has been approved and is moving forward.

On the less positive and immature processes side, the last BWG hosted in Lima raised questions concerning the size of the gathering and related cost effectiveness. Even without the BWG, there are routine opportunities for close and candid engagement in smaller meetings so the BWG format is certainly not mature. Of note, this was a change as the first BWG hosted in DC was indeed smaller and more focused.

Our impression of the last BWG hosted in Lima was that it was poorly organized and was disjointed in theme continuity from the previous BWG. It was probably more useful at the mid-level (field grade) working groups than at the large plenary session, which was neither revealing nor particularly candid. For instance, the power point slides on Peru's threats did not include Chile or Bolivia, probably because our host nation counterparts believed that the U.S. does not agree with Peru's assessment that its southern neighbors represent a critical security threat.

Despite the format issues, the overall usefulness of the BWG is unquestionable. The same applies to the strategic message of significant partnership sent by having direct engagement at the DASD level.

MCKINLEY